1. On or about March 24, 2025, in Maricopa County Arizona, Charlene Jackson-Etnire, did submit a written application for a civil harassment restraining order, from the Mesa City Court, executed under the penalty of perjury, in which she did willfully and knowingly state material matter to which she did not believe to be true.

2. It was material to the proceeding as described in paragraph 1.

3. On or about March 24, 2025, Charlene Jackson Etnire, while under oath as a party to a case Jackson v Gerlach, knowingly submitted a false statement with respect to a material issue as follows:

   **"She accused me of intentionally muting the recording system in the courtroom even though I do not control the recording system in the courtroom."**

4. The aforesaid statement in the application signed and submitted by Charlene Jackson Etnire, as she then and there well knew and believed, was false in that she does in fact have control over the recording system in her courtroom. Charlene Jackson's claim she does not have control over the recording system in her courtroom is provably false and universally known to be inaccurate by judicial officers across Maricopa County. Jackson's sworn denial directly contradicts her administrative role and appears designed to deflect accountability for missing or altered recordings.

   Jackson's sworn denial wasn't just false—it was a strategic attempt to suppress oversight and obstruct accountability. Her retaliatory civil harassment restraining order against Gerlach, filed after Gerlach publicly exposed these issues, further confirms a conscious effort to silence criticism and rewrite the public record. Jackson labeled Gerlach a "liar" and "conspiracy theorist" for quoting motions found on the public record and exposing Jackson's audio manipulation that amounts to Tampering with a Public Record and violations of due process.

   Multiple litigants—including Erin Gerlach—have submitted credible evidence of trimmed, muted, or missing For The Record ("FTR") audio recordings in proceedings overseen by Judge Charlene Jackson. These anomalies are disproportionately present in hearings where allegations of judicial misconduct were raised. Despite receiving repeated complaints, Judge Jackson failed to initiate any investigation, request technical assistance, or self-report these incidents to the Arizona Commission on Judicial Conduct.